arXiv:1701.01915v2 [math.NT] 15 Feb 2017

Erratic behavior of Fourier-coefficients of modular forms in short intervals

Yuri F. Bilu[1,2], Jean-Marc Deshouillers[2,3],
Sanoli Gun[1,4], Florian Luca[1,5,6]

February 16, 2017

Abstract

Let $\tau(\cdot)$ be the classical Ramanujan τ-function and let k be a positive integer such that $\tau(n) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq n \leq k/2$. (This is known to be true for $k < 10^{23}$, and, conjecturally, for all k.) Further, let σ be a permutation of the set $\{1, ..., k\}$. We show that there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that $|\tau(m + \sigma(1))| < \tau(m + \sigma(2))| < ... < |\tau(m + \sigma(k))|$. We also obtain a similar result for Fourier-coefficients of general newforms.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**
2 Coefficients of newforms **4**
3 Sieving **6**
4 Avoiding Prime Factors from a Sparse Set **17**
5 Proof of Theorem 1.2 **20**
6 Proof of Theorem 1.4 **24**

1 Introduction

Throughout the article a *newform* of weight κ and level N means a normalized holomorphic new Hecke eigenform of weight κ for $\Gamma_0(N)$ with the trivial character. A *non-CM newform* is an abbreviation for "newform without Complex Multiplication".

[1]Supported by the ALGANT program.
[2]Supported by the Indo-European Action Marie Curie (IRSES moduli).
[3]Supported by the CEFIPRA project 5401-A.
[4]Supported by a SERB grant and the DAE number theory plan project
[5]Supported by grant CPRR160325161141 and by an A-rated scientist award both from the NRF of South Africa.
[6]Supported by the grant no. 17-02804S of the Czech Granting Agency.

Let f be a newform and

$$f(z) := \sum_{n\geq 1} a_f(n) q^n, \qquad q = e^{2\pi i z}$$

be its Fourier expansion at $i\infty$. In particular, if f is of weight $\kappa = 12$ and level $N = 1$ then

$$f(z) = \Delta(z) := \sum_{n\geq 1} \tau(n) q^n = q \prod_{\ell \geq 1} (1-q^\ell)^{24},$$

where $\tau(n)$ is the classical Ramanujan function.

The Fourier-coefficients $a_f(n)$ are algebraic numbers, all belonging to some totally real number field. We fix an embedding of this field to $\mathbb{R}$ and, from now on, view the Fourier-coefficients as real algebraic numbers. In the sequel, we say "coefficients" instead of "Fourier-coefficients".

There is quite a few results demonstrating "erratic" behavior of the signs of $\tau(n)$, or, more generally, the coefficients of a general newforms; see, for instance, [5, 6, 9, 11, 12] and the references therein. For instance, Matomäki and Radziwiłł [12] show that the non-zero coefficients are positive and negative with the same frequency, and determine (up to a multiplicative constant) the asymptotic frequency of sign changes.

In this paper, we work in the orthogonal direction, and study the behavior of absolute values of non-zero coefficients. Classical results of Rankin [15, 16]

$$\sum_{n\leq x} |\tau(n)|^2 \asymp x^{12} \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{|\tau(n)|}{n^{11/2}} = +\infty$$

imply that the sequence $|\tau(n)|$ is not ultimately monotonic; in other words, each of the inequalities

$$|\tau(m+1)| < |\tau(m+2)|, \qquad |\tau(m+2)| < |\tau(m+1)|$$

holds for infinitely many m. In this article we obtain (as a special case of a more general result) a similar statement for more than two consecutive values of τ.

Theorem 1.1. *Let k be a positive integer such that*

$$\tau(n) \neq 0 \qquad (1 \leq n \leq k/2). \tag{1.1}$$

Then for every permutation σ of the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$, there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that

$$0 < |\tau(m+\sigma(1))| < |\tau(m+\sigma(2))| < \cdots < |\tau(m+\sigma(k))|. \tag{1.2}$$

In fact, existence of at least one m satisfying (1.2) implies (1.1), see Theorem 1.4 below; in other words, (1.1) is a necessary and sufficient condition for (1.2) to happen infinitely often.

It is known [19, Theorem 1.4] that $\tau(n) \neq 0$ when

$$n \leq 982149821766199295999 \approx 9 \cdot 10^{20}.$$

We also refer to the Corollary 1.2 of the unpublished article [3], which claims that $\tau(n) \neq 0$ for all $n \leq 816212624008487344127999 \approx 8 \cdot 10^{23}$.

According to a famous conjecture of Lehmer, $\tau(n) \neq 0$ for all n. If this conjecture holds true, then Theorem 1.1 applies to all k.

Our principal result is the following general theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_k$ be non-CM newforms and $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k$ distinct positive integers such that*

$$a_{f_i}(\nu_i) \neq 0 \qquad (1 \leq i \leq k). \tag{1.3}$$

Then there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that

$$0 < |a_{f_1}(m+\nu_1)| < |a_{f_2}(m+\nu_2)| < \cdots < |a_{f_k}(m+\nu_k)|. \tag{1.4}$$

In fact, we prove (see Remark 5.8) that for sufficiently large positive number x, there are at least $cx/(\log x)^k$ positive integers $m \leq x$ satisfying (1.4). Here $c > 0$ depends on $f_1, \ldots, f_k, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k$ and "sufficiently large" translates as "exceeding a certain quantity depending on $f_1, \ldots, f_k, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k$" .

In the most interesting special case when $f_1 = \cdots = f_k = f$ and $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k$ is a permutation of $1, \ldots, k$, we obtain the following immediate consequence.

Corollary 1.3. *Let f be a non-CM newform. Let k be a positive integer such that*

$$a_f(n) \neq 0 \qquad (1 \leq n \leq k). \tag{1.5}$$

Then for every permutation σ of the set $\{1, \ldots, k\}$, there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that

$$0 < |a_f(m+\sigma(1))| < |a_f(m+\sigma(2))| < \cdots < |a_f(m+\sigma(k))|. \tag{1.6}$$

In fact, one can do even better: to give a necessary and sufficient condition for having (1.6) infinitely often.

Theorem 1.4. *Let k be a positive integer. Then for a non-CM newform f the following three conditions are equivalent.*

A. We have

$$a_f(n) \neq 0 \qquad (1 \leq n \leq k/2).$$

B. For some positive integer ν we have

$$a_f(\nu+n) \neq 0 \qquad (1 \leq n \leq k).$$

C. For every permutation σ of the set $\{1, \ldots, k\}$, there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that

$$0 < |a_f(m+\sigma(1))| < |a_f(m+\sigma(2))| < \cdots < |a_f(m+\sigma(k))|.$$

Theorem 1.1 follows from this theorem if we take $f = \Delta$.

Techniques of the proofs rely on elementary arguments, sieve methods (Brun's sieve, the Bombieri-Vinogradov Theorem), and the truth of the Sato-Tate conjecture for non-CM forms.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly review the properties of the coefficients of newforms used in the sequel. In Sections 3 and 4, we obtain two sieving results instrumental for the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.4. Finally, these theorems are proved in Sections 5 and 6, respectively.

1.1 Conventions

Unless the contrary is stated explicitly:

- p (with or without indices) denotes a prime number;
- κ denotes a positive even integer;
- i, j, k, ℓ, m (with or without indices) denote positive integers;
- n (with or without indices) denotes a non-negative integer;
- d (with or without indices) denotes a square-free positive integer;
- ε, δ denote real numbers satisfying $0 < \varepsilon, \delta \leq 1/2$;
- x, y, z, t denote real numbers satisfying $x, y, z, t \geq 2$.

2 Coefficients of newforms

In this section, we list some well-known properties of the coefficients of newforms which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

First of all, the Fourier-coefficients $a_f(n)$ are multiplicative:

$$a_f(mn) = a_f(m)a_f(n) \qquad (m, n \geq 1, \quad \gcd(m, n) = 1). \tag{2.1}$$

Furthermore, the values of a_f at prime powers satisfy the following recurrence relation

$$a_f(p^{\ell+1}) = a_f(p)a_f(p^{\ell}) - p^{\kappa-1}a_f(p^{\ell-1}) \qquad (\ell = 1, 2, \ldots), \tag{2.2}$$

where κ is the weight of f.

Both (2.1) and (2.2) were conjectured by Ramanujan when $f = \Delta$ and proved by Mordell [13]. Proofs can be found in many sources; see, for instance [4, Proposition 5.8.5.].

A much deeper result is the upper estimate

$$|a_f(p)| \leq 2p^{(\kappa-1)/2}. \tag{2.3}$$

It was also conjectured by Ramanujan when $f = \Delta$ and proved by Deligne [2, Théorème 8.2]. Equivalently, the polynomial $T^2 - a_f(p)T + p^{\kappa-1}$ can not have distinct real roots. Hence we may write the roots as

$$\alpha_p = p^{(\kappa-1)/2} e^{i\theta_p}, \qquad \bar{\alpha}_p = p^{(\kappa-1)/2} e^{-i\theta_p}, \tag{2.4}$$

with $\theta_p \in [0, \pi]$. If $\theta_p \neq 0, \pi$ (that is, $a_f(p) \neq \pm 2p^{(\kappa-1)/2}$) then

$$a_f(p^\ell) = \frac{\alpha_p^{\ell+1} - \bar{\alpha}_p^{\ell+1}}{\alpha_p - \bar{\alpha}_p} = p^{\ell(\kappa-1)/2} \frac{\sin(\ell+1)\theta_p}{\sin \theta_p}. \tag{2.5}$$

We may add for completeness that

$$a_f(p^\ell) = \begin{cases} (\ell+1)p^{\ell(\kappa-1)/2}, & \theta_p = 0, \\ (-1)^\ell(\ell+1)p^{\ell(\kappa-1)/2}, & \theta_p = \pi. \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

Another very deep result is the *Sato-Tate conjecture*, proved recently by Barnet-Lamb, Geraghty, Harris and Taylor [1, Theorem B]. According to it, for a non-CM newform f, the numbers $a_f(p)/p^{(\kappa-1)/2}$ are equidistributed in the interval $[-2, 2]$ with respect to the measure $(2/\pi)\sqrt{1-t^2}dt$. This means that for $-2 \leq a \leq b \leq 2$, we have

$$\frac{\#\{p \leq x : a_f(p)/p^{(\kappa-1)/2} \in [a, b]\}}{\pi(x)} \to \frac{2}{\pi} \int_a^b \sqrt{1-t^2}dt \tag{2.7}$$

as $x \to \infty$. Here, $\pi(x)$ is the number of primes up to x.

An immediate consequence is the following statement.

Proposition 2.1. *Let f be a non-CM newform. Then the following holds.*

A. The relative density of the set of primes p such that $a_f(p)/p^{(\kappa-1)/2}$ belongs to a given interval of length 2ε does not exceed ε.

B. In particular, the relative density of primes p such that $a_f(p) = 0$ or $\pm 2p^{(\kappa-1)/2}$ is 0.

Of course, part B was well known long before the proof of the Sato-Tate conjecture. See Théorème 15 in [18, Section 7.2] for a much more general and quantitatively stronger result.

Equations (2.5) and (2.6) imply that $a_f(p^\ell) = 0$ for some ℓ if and only if $\theta_p/\pi \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$. In fact, one knows the following result.

Proposition 2.2. *Let f be a non-CM newform. Then for all but finitely many primes p we have either $a_f(p) \in \{0, \pm 2p^{(\kappa-1)/2}\}$ or $\theta_p/\pi \notin \mathbb{Q}$.*

For the proof, see [14, Lemma 2.5].

One may remark that if f is of weight $\kappa \geq 4$ then this holds for all p without exceptions, see [14, Proposition 2.4].

3 Sieving

In this and the subsequent sections, we establish two sieving results instrumental for the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.4.

The integer m in this section is not necessarily positive; it can be any integer: positive, negative or 0. The other conventions made in Subsection 1.1 remain intact.

3.1 The Sieving Theorem

Let Σ be a finite set of prime numbers. We call $m \in \mathbb{Z}$

- Σ-*unit*, if all its prime divisors belong to Σ;
- Σ-*square-free*, if m is a product of a Σ-unit and a square-free integer.

Also, for $z \geq 2$ we define

$$P_\Sigma(z) = \prod_{\substack{p<z \\ p\notin\Sigma}} p. \tag{3.1}$$

Now let $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ be integers satisfying

$$a_i \neq 0, \quad \gcd(a_i, b_i) = 1 \qquad (i = 1, \dots, k), \tag{3.2}$$

$$a_i b_j - a_j b_i \neq 0 \qquad (1 \leq i < j \leq k). \tag{3.3}$$

We consider linear forms $L_i(n) = a_i n + b_i$ and for $x \geq z \geq 2$, we set

$$\mathfrak{V}(x,z) = \big\{n : 0 \leq n \leq x, \quad \gcd\big(L_1(n)\cdots L_k(n),\ P_\Sigma(z)\big) = 1\big\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Finally, we denote by $\mathfrak{V}_1(x,z)$, the subset of $\mathfrak{V}(x,z)$ consisting of n for which $L_1(n), \dots, L_k(n)$ are Σ-square-free composite numbers.

The principal result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that Σ contains all primes $p \leq 2k$, all prime divisors of every a_i, and all prime divisors of every $a_i b_j - a_j b_i$ with $i \neq j$. In other words, we assume that*

$$(2k)! \prod_{i=1}^{k} a_i \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq k} (a_i b_j - a_j b_i) \text{ is a } \Sigma\text{-unit.} \tag{3.5}$$

Then there exist real numbers $\eta, c_1 \in (0, 1/2]$, depending only on k and on the cardinality[7] $\#\Sigma$ (but not on Σ or on the integers a_i and b_i), and $z_1 \geq 2$ depending on $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k$, such that the following holds. For any x and z, satisfying $x^\eta \geq z \geq z_1$, we have $\#\mathfrak{V}_1(x,z) \geq c_1 x (\log z)^{-k}$.

[7] Indicating dependence on k here is a bit obsolete, because our hypothesis implies that k is bounded in terms of $\#\Sigma$.

In Subsection 3.2, we briefly recall the basics of Brun sieve, following mainly the Halberstam-Richert classical treatise [7]. In Subsection 3.3, we use the Brun sieve to establish the order of magnitude of $\#\mho(x,z)$. In Subsections 3.4 and 3.5, we bound from above the number of unwanted $n \in \mho(x,z)$, those for which some $L_i(n)$ is prime or non-squarefree. Finally, in Subsection 3.6, we complete the proof of Theorem 3.1.

3.2 Outline of the Brun Sieve

In this subsection, we give a quick overview of the combinatorial Brun sieve in the form used in sequel. Our principal reference is [7, Chapters 1 and 2], especially Section 2.4. For the reader's convenience, we try to follow the set-up adopted in [7], with a few exceptions that will be highlighted below.

Recall that, in this article, d (with or without indices) stands for a square-free positive integer. For every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we associate a non-negative real number $a(m)$, such that $a(m) = 0$ for all but finitely many m. For every d, we set

$$\mathcal{A}_d = \sum_{d|m} a(m).$$

Remark 3.2. *In [7], $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite multi-set of integers (and $\mathcal{A}_d$ is the subset of $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of the integers divisible by d). Defining such a multi-set is equivalent to defining a sequence $a(m)$ as above consisting of non-negative integers. Hence the results from [7] are formally proved only for such sequences. However, integrality of the numbers $a(m)$ is never used in the arguments from [7] that we quote, so the results actually hold true for any sequences of non-negative real numbers.*

We also fix a multiplicative function ρ (in [7] it is denoted by ω) supported at square-free numbers and having the following properties.

A. There exists a real number $A_1 \geq 1$ such that for every prime p, we have

$$0 \leq \frac{\rho(p)}{p} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{A_1} \tag{3.6}$$

(condition (Ω_1) on page 29 of [7]).

B. There exist real numbers $\alpha > 0$ (in [7] it is denoted by κ) and $A_2 \geq 1$ such that for $z \geq w \geq 2$, we have

$$\sum_{w \leq p < z} \frac{\rho(p)\log p}{p} \leq \alpha \log \frac{z}{w} + A_2 \tag{3.7}$$

(condition $(\Omega_2(\alpha))$ on page 52 of [7]).

Next we fix a real number $X > 1$ and write, for every d,

$$\mathcal{A}_d = \frac{\rho(d)}{d} X + R_d,$$

where R_d are some real numbers.

Let Σ be a set of prime numbers (it corresponds to the set $\bar{\mathfrak{P}}$ in [7]); for $z \geq 2$, we set

$$\mathcal{S}(z) = \sum_{(m, P_\Sigma(z))=1} a(m), \tag{3.8}$$

$$W(z) = \prod_{p | P_\Sigma(z)} \left(1 - \frac{\rho(p)}{p}\right), \tag{3.9}$$

where $P_\Sigma(z)$ is defined in (3.1).

The following statement is a version of Theorem 2.1 on page 57 of [7] (we set the parameter b therein to be 1). We denote by $\omega(d)$ the number of distinct prime divisors of d.

Theorem 3.3. *Let λ be a positive real number satisfying $0 < \lambda e^{1+\lambda} < 1$. Set*

$$c_1 = \frac{A_2}{2}\left(1 + A_1\left(\alpha + \frac{A_2}{\log 2}\right)\right), \quad \varepsilon = \frac{1}{200 e^{1/\alpha}}, \quad \Lambda = \frac{2\lambda}{\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}\right), \tag{3.10}$$

where A_1, A_2 and α are from (3.6), (3.7). *Then for $z \geq 2$, we have the following estimates:*

$$\mathcal{S}(z) \leq XW(z)\left(1 + 2\frac{\lambda^3 e^{2\lambda}}{1 - \lambda^2 e^{2+2\lambda}} \exp\left(\frac{5c_1}{\lambda \log z}\right)\right) \tag{3.11}$$

$$+ \sum_{\substack{d | P_\Sigma(z),\ d < z^{2e^\Lambda \Lambda^{-1}}, \\ \omega(d) < 2\Lambda^{-1}(\log\log z - \log\log 2) + 2}} |R_d|, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\mathcal{S}(z) \geq XW(z)\left(1 - 2\frac{\lambda^2 e^{2\lambda}}{1 - \lambda^2 e^{2+2\lambda}} \exp\left(\frac{4c_1}{\lambda \log z}\right)\right) \tag{3.13}$$

$$- \sum_{\substack{d | P_\Sigma(z),\ d < z^{2e^\Lambda \Lambda^{-1} - 1}, \\ \omega(d) < 2\Lambda^{-1}(\log\log z - \log\log 2) + 1}} |R_d|. \tag{3.14}$$

The first summands in (3.11) and (3.13) (those of the form $XW(z)(\cdots)$ are exactly the same as in equations (4.2) and (4.3) on page 57 of [7], if you set $b = 1$ therein. However, our "error term" (the sum involving $|R_d|$) is totally different. The reason is that in [7] condition $|R_d| \leq \rho(d)$ (that is, condition (R) on page 30) is imposed, and we do not want to impose it.

We briefly explain below how the argument on pages 57–62 of [7] can be adapted to prove Theorem 3.3.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Throughout the proof, we denote $P_\Sigma(z)$ by $P(z)$.

Let r be a positive integer and $z_0, \ldots, z_r$ be real numbers satisfying

$$z = z_0 > z_1 > z_2 > \cdots > z_r = 2;$$

they will be specified later. We consider functions χ_1 and χ_2 defined on the set of divisors of $P(z)$ as follows:

- $\chi_1(d) = 1$ if d has at most $2n$ prime divisors in the interval $[z_n, z)$ for every $n = 1, \dots, r$, and $\chi_1(d) = 0$ otherwise;
- $\chi_2(d) = 1$ if d has at most $2n-1$ prime divisors in the interval $[z_n, z)$ for every $n = 1, \dots, r$, and $\chi_1(d) = 0$ otherwise;

(These definitions are equivalent to equation (4.8) on page 58 of [7], if we set $b = 1$ therein.)

It is explained in [7] that with this definition of χ_1 and χ_2 we have

$$\mathcal{S}(z) \le X \sum_{d|P(z)} \mu(d)\chi_1(d)\frac{\rho(d)}{d} + \sum_{d|P(z)} \chi_1(d)|R_d|, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\mathcal{S}(z) \ge X \sum_{d|P(z)} \mu(d)\chi_2(d)\frac{\rho(d)}{d} - \sum_{d|P(z)} \chi_2(d)|R_d|. \tag{3.16}$$

See equation (4.5) on page 57 of [7].

Now let us specify $z_0, \dots, z_r$. We follow [7, page 60]. Choose r to be the only positive integer with the property

$$e^{(r-1)\Lambda} < \frac{\log z}{\log 2} \le e^{r\Lambda}, \tag{3.17}$$

where Λ is defined in (3.10). Now define the numbers z_n by

$$\log z_n = e^{-n\Lambda} \log z \quad (n = 0, 1, \dots, r-1), \qquad z_r = 2.$$

It is shown on pages 57–62 of [7] that with this choice of z_n we have the estimates

$$\sum_{d|P(z)} \mu(d)\chi_1(d)\frac{\rho(d)}{d} \le W(z)\left(1 + 2\frac{\lambda^3 e^{2\lambda}}{1-\lambda^2 e^{2+2\lambda}} \exp\left(\frac{5c_1}{\lambda \log z}\right)\right),$$

$$\sum_{d|P(z)} \mu(d)\chi_2(d)\frac{\rho(d)}{d} \ge W(z)\left(1 - 2\frac{\lambda^2 e^{2\lambda}}{1-\lambda^2 e^{2+2\lambda}} \exp\left(\frac{4c_1}{\lambda \log z}\right)\right).$$

So, we are left with the error terms.

Our definition of r implies that

$$r < \Lambda^{-1}(\log\log z - \log\log 2) + 1.$$

Hence, for d with $\chi_1(d) = 1$, we have

$$\omega(d) < 2r \le 2\Lambda^{-1}(\log\log z - \log\log 2) + 2.$$

Furthermore, it follows from our definitions that for such d we have

$$d \le z_0^2 \cdots z_{r-1}^2 \le z^{2(1+e^{-\Lambda}+\cdots+e^{-(r-1)\Lambda})} < z^{2(1-e^{-\Lambda})^{-1}} < z^{2e^{\Lambda}\Lambda^{-1}}.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{d|P(z)} \chi_1(d)|R_d| \le \sum_{\substack{d|P(z),\ d<z^{2e^{\Lambda}\Lambda^{-1}},\\ \omega(d)<2\Lambda^{-1}(\log\log z-\log\log 2)+2}} |R_d|.$$

In a similar way, one proves that

$$\sum_{d|P(z)} \chi_2(d)|R_d| \le \sum_{\substack{d|P(z),\ d<z^{2e^{\Lambda}\Lambda^{-1}-1},\\ \omega(d)<2\Lambda^{-1}(\log\log z-\log\log 2)+1}} |R_d|.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.3. □

Here is a much less precise, but more compact and convenient version of Theorem 3.3.

Corollary 3.4. *In the set-up of Theorem 3.3 assume that $\alpha \ge 1$. Then there exists $z_0 \ge 2$, depending on α, A_1 and A_2, such that for $z \ge z_0$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2}XW(z) - \mathcal{R}(z) \le \mathcal{S}(z) \le 2XW(z) + \mathcal{R}(z),$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}(z) = \sum_{\substack{d|P_\Sigma(z),\ d<z^{20\alpha},\\ \omega(d)<20\alpha\log\log z}} |R_d|.$$

Proof. Set in Theorem 3.3 $\lambda = 0.1$. Then $0.2 \ge \Lambda \ge (6\alpha)^{-1}$, and the result follows by an easy calculation. □

3.3 Sieving away small primes factors

In this and the subsequent subsections we use the notation and the set-up of Subsection 3.1.

Proposition 3.5. *In the set-up of Theorem 3.1, there exists real numbers $z_0 \ge 2$ and $c \in (0, 1/2]$, both depending only on k such that for x and z, satisfying $x \ge z^{50k}$ and $z \ge z_0$ we have*

$$c\frac{x}{(\log z)^k} \le \#\mathfrak{V}(x,z) \le c^{-1}\cdot 2^{\#\Sigma}\frac{x}{(\log z)^k}. \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. In this proof, unless the contrary is stated explicitly, the constants implied by the notation $O(\cdot)$, $\ll$, $\gg$ or[8] $\asymp$, may depend only on k. The same convention applies to the the constants implied by the expressions like "sufficiently large".

Let ρ be the multiplicative function concentrated on the square-free numbers and such that

$$\rho(p) = \begin{cases} k, & p \notin \Sigma, \\ 0, & p \in \Sigma. \end{cases}$$

[8] We use $A \asymp B$ as a shortcut for $A \ll B \ll A$.

Our assumption (3.5) implies that the congruence

$$L_1(n)\cdots L_k(n)\equiv 0 \bmod d$$

has exactly $\rho(d)=k^{\omega(d)}$ solutions for any square-free d having no prime divisors from the set Σ. Also, since all primes $p\le 2k$ belong to Σ, we have

$$0\le\frac{\rho(p)}{p}\le\frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.19}$$

for all p; in other words, condition (3.6) holds true with $A_1=2$.

Now we fix $x\ge 2$ and let $a(m)$ be the characteristic function of the finite multi-set $\{L_1(n)\cdots L_k(n): 0\le n\le x\}$. Precisely:

$$a(m)=\#\{n: 0\le n\le x,\ L_1(n)\cdots L_k(n)=m\}.$$

We use the notation $\mathcal{A}_d$ and $W(z)$ of Subsection 3.2, and set $X=x$. It is clear that

$$\mathcal{A}_d=\frac{\rho(d)}{d}x+R_d,\qquad |R_d|\le d \tag{3.20}$$

when d has no prime divisors from Σ, and that the $\#\mathcal{U}(x,z)=\mathcal{S}(z)$, where $\mathcal{S}(z)$ is defined in (3.8). Furthermore, for $p\in\Sigma$, $p\ge 2k$ we have

$$1-\frac{k}{p}\le 1-\frac{\rho(p)}{p}\le 2\left(1-\frac{k}{p}\right).$$

Hence,

$$\prod_{2k<p\le z}\left(1-\frac{k}{p}\right)\le W(z)\le 2^{\#\Sigma-\pi(2k)}\prod_{2k<p\le z}\left(1-\frac{k}{p}\right). \tag{3.21}$$

Furthermore, the Mertens theorem $\sum_{p\le z}1/p=\log\log z+O(1)$ implies that

$$\prod_{2k<p\le z}\left(1-\frac{k}{p}\right)\asymp(\log z)^{-k}. \tag{3.22}$$

As we have seen above, condition (3.6) is satisfied. Another Mertens theorem $\sum_{p\le z}(\log p)/p=\log z+O(1)$ implies that condition (3.7) holds true as well with $\alpha=k$ (and with some A_2 depending only on k). Hence, we are entitled to use Corollary 3.4 with $\alpha=k$: for sufficiently large z we have

$$\frac{1}{2}xW(z)-\mathcal{R}(z)\le\#\mathcal{U}(x,z)\le 2xW(z)+\mathcal{R}(z). \tag{3.23}$$

We estimate $\mathcal{R}(z)$ trivially, using (3.20):

$$\mathcal{R}(z)\le\sum_{d\le z^{20k}}|d|\le z^{40k}.$$

Hence, when $x\ge z^{50k}$ we have $\mathcal{R}(z)\le x^{4/5}$. Together with (3.21), (3.22) and (3.23) this proves (3.18) for sufficiently large z with a suitable c. □

3.4 Sieving away prime values

We continue using the notation of Subsection 3.1. Now we want to bound the number of $n \in \mathfrak{U}(x,z)$ such that one of $L_i(n)$ is a prime number. It suffices to do it for one fixed i, for instance, for $i=k$. In the sequel, we write $a=a_k$, $b=b_k$ and $L(n)=L_k(n)=an+b$. We prove the following.

Proposition 3.6. *In the set-up of Theorem 3.1, there exists $C \geq 2$, depending only on k, and $z_0 \geq 2$, depending on the coefficients $a_1,\dots,a_k,b_1,\dots,b_k$, such that for any x and z, satisfying $x \geq z^{60(k-1)}$ and $z \geq z_0$, there are at most $C \cdot 2^{\#\Sigma} x(\log z)^{-k+1}(\log x)^{-1}$ elements $n \in \mathfrak{U}(x,z)$ such that $L(n)$ is a prime number.*

The proof uses, besides the Brun sieve, the Theorem of Bombieri-Vinogradov. Given coprime integers $q \neq 0$ and b, we use the standard notation

$$\psi(x;b,q) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m \leq x \\ m \equiv b \bmod q}} \Lambda(m),$$

where $\Lambda(\cdot)$ is the von Mangoldt function. We also denote by $\varphi(\cdot)$ the Euler's totient, and by $\omega(\cdot)$ the number of prime divisors (counted without multiplicities). It will be convenient to use the notation

$$\mathrm{bv}(x,q) = \max_{(b,q)=1} \left| \psi(x;b,q) - \frac{x}{\varphi(q)} \right|, \tag{3.24}$$

the maximum being over all residue classes $\bmod q$ coprime with q.

Proposition 3.7 (Theorem of Bombieri-Vinogradov)**.** *Let $A>1$ and $\varepsilon>0$ be real numbers. Then for every $x \geq 2$, we have*

$$\sum_{1 \leq q \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \mathrm{bv}(x,q) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},$$

where the implied constant depends only on A and ε.

See [8, Theorem 17.1]. In fact, a stronger statement is proved therein, with $x^{1/2}(\log x)^{-B}$ instead of $x^{1/2-\varepsilon}$, where $B=2A+26$.

Proof of Proposition 3.6. In this proof, unless the contrary is stated explicitly,

- the constants implied by the notation $O(\cdot)$, $\ll$, $\gg$ or $\asymp$ may depend only on k;
- the constants implied by "sufficiently large" or similar expressions depend on $a_1,\dots,a_k,b_1,\dots,b_k$.

We want to show that, for sufficiently large x and z, satisfying $x \geq z^{60(k-1)}$, the estimate

$$\sum_{n \in \mathfrak{U}(x,z)} \Lambda(L(n)) \ll 2^{\#\Sigma} \frac{x}{(\log z)^{k-1}} \tag{3.25}$$

holds true. Once we prove (3.25), the proposition follows easily by the following standard argument:

$$\sum_{\substack{n\in\mathcal{U}(x,z)\\ L(n)\text{ is prime}}} 1 \le x^{1/2} + 1 + \frac{1}{\log(x^{1/2}-|b|)} \sum_{\substack{n\in\mathcal{U}(x,z)\\ n\ge x^{1/2}}} \Lambda(L(n))$$
$$\ll x^{1/2} + \frac{1}{\log(x^{1/2}-|b|)} \cdot 2^{\#\Sigma}\frac{x}{(\log z)^{k-1}}.$$

When x is sufficiently large, the right-hand side is bounded by the quantity

$$4\cdot 2^{\#\Sigma} x(\log z)^{-k+1}(\log x)^{-1},$$

as required.

Let us now proceed to prove (3.25). The proof being quite long, we split it into shorter steps to facilitate reading.

Using the Brun Sieve. Let ρ be the multiplicative function supported on the square-free numbers and such that

$$\rho(p) = \begin{cases} p(k-1)/(p-1), & \text{if } p\notin\Sigma,\\ 0, & \text{if } p\in\Sigma. \end{cases}$$

It follows from (3.5) that the congruence

$$L_1(n)\cdots L_{k-1}(n) \equiv 0 \bmod d \tag{3.26}$$

has exactly $\rho(d)\varphi(d)/d = (k-1)^{\omega(d)}$ solutions for any d having no prime divisors from the set Σ. Also since all primes $p\le 2k$ belong to Σ, we have

$$0 \le \frac{\rho(p)}{p} = \frac{k-1}{p-1} < \frac{1}{2}$$

for all p, so condition (3.6) is satisfied.

We fix $x\ge 2$ and define

$$a(m) = \sum_{\substack{0\le n\le x\\ L_1(n)\cdots L_{k-1}(n)=m}} \Lambda(L(n)).$$

We again define $\mathcal{A}_d$ and $W(z)$ as in Subsection 3.2, but this time we set $X = (a/\varphi(a))x$. (We assume, as we may, without loss of generality, that $a>0$.) We write

$$\mathcal{A}_d = \frac{\rho(d)}{d}\frac{a}{\varphi(a)}x \ + \ R_d.$$

We will deal with the error terms R_d later.

Clearly, the left-hand side of (3.25) is equal to $\mathcal{S}(z)$, where $\mathcal{S}(z)$ is defined in (3.8). Furthermore, in the same way as in the proof of Proposition 3.5, we show that

$$W(z) \ll 2^{\#\Sigma} \prod_{2k<p\le z}\left(1-\frac{k-1}{p-1}\right) \asymp (\log z)^{-k+1}. \tag{3.27}$$

As we have seen above, condition (3.6) is satisfied. As in the proof of Proposition 3.5, condition (3.7) holds true as well with $\alpha = k-1$ and A_2 depending on k. Hence, we may use Corollary 3.4 with $\alpha = k-1$: for sufficiently large z, we have

$$\sum_{n \in \mathfrak{V}(x,z)} \Lambda(L(n)) \le 2\frac{a}{\varphi(a)} x W(z) + \mathcal{R}(z) \tag{3.28}$$

(we will need only the upper bound).

We now have to estimate

$$\mathcal{R}(z) = \sum_{\text{d satisfies (3.29)}} |R_d|,$$

the sum being over all d satisfying

$$d \mid P_\Sigma(z), \quad d < z^{20(k-1)}, \quad \omega(d) < 20(k-1)\log\log z. \tag{3.29}$$

Estimating $|R_d|$. We start from the "individual" error terms R_d. Thus let us fix d satisfying (3.29). We have

$$\mathcal{A}_d = \sum_{\substack{0 \le n \le x \\ L_1(n)\cdots L_{k-1}(n) \equiv 0 \bmod d}} \Lambda(L(n)).$$

The sum above is over all non-negative $n \le x$ belonging to one of $(k-1)^{\omega(d)}$ residue classes $\bmod d$ satisfying (3.26). Let $n \equiv \beta \bmod d$ be one such class. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \le n \le x \\ n \equiv \beta \bmod d}} \Lambda(L(n)) = \psi(ax; L(\beta), ad) + O(M\log(2Mx)),$$

where we denote $M = \max\{a, |b|\}$. This implies that

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{0 \le n \le x \\ n \equiv \beta \bmod d}} \Lambda(L(n)) - \frac{1}{\varphi(a)\varphi(d)} ax \right| \le \mathrm{bv}(ax, ad) + O(M\log(2Mx)),$$

where $\mathrm{bv}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is defined in (3.24). (Here, we have $\varphi(ad) = \varphi(a)\varphi(d)$ because $\gcd(a,d) = 1$; indeed, all prime divisors of a belong to Σ, and none of these primes may divide d.)

Now let $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$ be all such residue classes, $s = \rho(d)\varphi(d)/d = (k-1)^{\omega(d)}$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|R_d| &= \left| \mathcal{A}_d - \frac{\rho(d)}{d}\frac{a}{\varphi(a)}x \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{\substack{0\le n\le x \\ L_1(n)\cdots L_{k-1}(n)\equiv 0 \bmod d}} \Lambda(L(n)) - \frac{(k-1)^{\omega(d)}}{\varphi(a)\varphi(d)}ax \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{i=1}^{s} \left(\sum_{\substack{0\le n\le x \\ n\equiv \beta_i \bmod d}} \Lambda(L(n)) - \frac{1}{\varphi(a)\varphi(d)}ax \right) \right| \\
&\le (k-1)^{\omega(d)}\big(\mathrm{bv}(ax,ad) + O(M\log(2Mx))\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Since d satisfies (3.29), we have

$$(k-1)^{\omega(d)} \le (k-1)^{20(k-1)\log\log z} = (\log z)^{20(k-1)\log(k-1)}.$$

Thus, we proved the estimate

$$|R_d| \le (\log z)^{20(k-1)\log(k-1)}\big(\mathrm{bv}(ax,ad) + O(M\log(2Mx))\big).$$

Using the Bombieri-Vinogradov Theorem. Summing up, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}(z) \le \quad & (\log z)^{20(k-1)\log(k-1)} \sum_{d\le z^{20(k-1)}} \mathrm{bv}(ax,ad) \\
& + \ O\big(z^{20(k-1)}(\log z)^{20(k-1)\log(k-1)} M\log(2Mx)\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

Since $x \ge z^{60(k-1)}$, by the assumption, we have $az^{20(k-1)} \le (ax)^{0.4}$ for sufficiently large z. Hence, applying Proposition 3.7 with $\varepsilon = 0.1$, we obtain, for any $A \ge 1$, the estimate

$$\sum_{d\le z^{20(k-1)}} \mathrm{bv}(ax,ad) \le \sum_{q\le (ax)^{0.4}} \mathrm{bv}(ax,q) \ll \frac{ax}{(\log ax)^A},$$

the implied constant depending only on A. Setting

$$A = 20(k-1)\log(k-1) + k + 1,$$

we obtain the estimate

$$(\log z)^{20(k-1)\log(k-1)} \sum_{d\le z^{20(k-1)}} \mathrm{bv}(ax,ad) \ll \frac{ax}{(\log ax)^{k+1}}.$$

For sufficiently large z, the right-hand side is bounded by $x(\log z)^{-k}$. Thus we have proved that, for large z, the first term on the right of (3.30) is $O(x(\log z)^{-k})$.

As for the second term in the right-hand side of (3.30), it is bounded by $x^{1/2}$ for sufficiently large z.

We have proved that for large z and x satisfying $x \geq z^{60(k-1)}$, one has

$$\mathcal{R}(z) \ll \frac{x}{(\log z)^k} + x^{1/2}.$$

Together with (3.28), this implies (3.25). □

Here is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.6.

Corollary 3.8. *In the set-up of Theorem 3.1, let x and z be sufficiently large real numbers satisfying $x \geq z^{60(k-1)}$. Then the set $\mathfrak{U}(x,z)$ has at most $O(x(\log z)^{-k+1}(\log x)^{-1})$ elements n such that $L_i(n)$ is prime for some i. Here the $O(\cdot)$ constant depends only on k, and the "sufficiently large" depends on $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k$.*

3.5 Sieving away non-squarefree values

We also want to count n such that $L_i(n)$ is not Σ-squarefree. This is relatively easy. Set

$$M = \max\{|a_1|, \dots, |a_k|, |b_1|, \dots, |b_k|\}.$$

Proposition 3.9. *In the set-up of Theorem 3.1, for $x \geq z \geq 2$ the set $\mathfrak{U}(x,z)$ has at most*

$$kM\left(\frac{x+1}{z-1}\right) + k\sqrt{Mx+M}$$

elements n such that $L_i(n)$ is not Σ-squarefree for some i.

Proof. If $L_i(n)$ is not Σ-squarefree for some $n \in \mathfrak{U}(x,z)$, then $p^2 \mid L_i(n)$ for some $p \geq z$. For a fixed p and i, the number of positive integers n with the property $p^2 \mid L_i(n)$ does not exceed $(|a_i|x + |b_i|)/p^2 + 1$. Summing up over all $p \geq z$ and $i = 1, \dots, k$, we estimate the total number of $n \in \mathfrak{U}(x,z)$ such that some $L_i(n)$ is not Σ-squarefree as

$$k(Mx+M)\sum_{p \geq z} \frac{1}{p^2} + k \cdot \pi\left(\sqrt{Mx+M}\right).$$

The infinite sum above is bounded by $1/(z-1)$, whence the result. □

3.6 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.1. Proposition 3.6, Corollary 3.8 and Proposition 3.9, taken together, imply that there exists a positive number θ, depending only on k and $\#\Sigma$, and $z_1 \geq 2$ depending on $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k$ such that the following two statements hold true.

- If x and z satisfy $x \geq z^{50k}$ and $z \geq z_1$, then the set $\mathfrak{U}(x,z)$ has at least $\theta x(\log z)^{-k}$ elements n such that $L_i(n)$ is Σ-squarefree for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

- If x and z satisfy $x \geq z^{60(k-1)}$ and $z \geq z_1$, then the set $\mathfrak{V}(x,z)$ has at most $\theta^{-1}x(\log z)^{-k+1}(\log x)^{-1}$ elements n such that $L_i(n)$ is prime for some i.

Now set

$$\eta = \min\{(50k)^{-1}, (60(k-1))^{-1}, \theta^2/2\}.$$

Then $x^\eta \geq z$ implies that

$$\theta^{-1}x(\log z)^{-k+1}(\log x)^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}\theta x(\log z)^{-k}.$$

Hence, for x and z satisfying $x^\eta \geq z \geq z_1$, the set $\mathfrak{V}_1(x,z)$ has at least $(\theta/2)x(\log z)^{-k}$ elements. This completes the proof of the theorem.

4 Avoiding Prime Factors from a Sparse Set

In this section, we further refine the set $\mathfrak{V}_1(x,z)$ constructed in Theorem 3.1, showing that it has "many" elements n such that $L_1(n)\cdots L_k(n)$ has no prime divisors in a "sufficiently sparse" set of primes. We will have to impose an additional assumption: every prime from Σ divides every a_i. Probably the statement holds true without this assumption, but imposing it will facilitate the proof, and the result we obtain will suffice for us.

Given an infinite set of primes $\mathcal{P}$, we define its upper relative density $\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{P})$ by $\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{P}) = \limsup_{x\to+\infty} \pi_{\mathcal{P}}(x)/\pi(x)$ where we set $\pi_{\mathcal{P}}(x) = \#(\mathcal{P}\cap[0,x])$. Let $L_1(n),\dots,L_k(n)$ and the finite set Σ be as in Subsection 3.1.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1. Moreover, assume that*

$$\text{every } a_i \text{ is divisible by every prime from } \Sigma. \tag{4.1}$$

Let η be the number as in Theorem 3.1. Then there exists $\varepsilon \in (0,1/2]$, depending only on k and on $\#\Sigma$, such that the following holds. For any set $\mathcal{P}$ of primes with $\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \varepsilon$, there exists $x_0 \geq 2$ depending on $a_1,\dots,a_k,b_1,\dots,b_k$ and on the set $\mathcal{P}$, such that for $x \geq x_0$ at least half of the elements n of the set $\mathfrak{V}_1(x,x^\eta)$ have the property

$$p \nmid L_1(n)\cdots L_k(n) \qquad (p \in \mathcal{P}).$$

We start from an individual prime. In the sequel, we write $a = a_k$, $b = b_k$ and $L(n) = L_k(n) = an + b$. We also set $M = \max\{|a|,|b|\}$.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1. Further, assume that*

$$\text{every prime from } \Sigma \text{ divides } a. \tag{4.2}$$

Then there exist real numbers $C_3 \geq 2$ depending only on k, and $z_3 \geq 2$ depending on k and M such that the following holds. Let p be a prime number, $p \notin \Sigma$. Then for any x and z satisfying $x \geq z \geq z_3$, the set $\mathfrak{V}_1(x,z)$ has at most $C_3 \cdot 2^{\#\Sigma}(x/p)(\log z)^{-k}$ elements n such that $p \mid L(n)$.

Proof. In this proof, every constant implied by $O(\cdot)$, $\ll$ etc. depends only on k. We may assume that $L(n)$ is divisible by p for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (otherwise there is nothing to prove). It follows that $p \nmid a$. (Indeed, if $p \mid a$ then $p \nmid b$ because a and b are coprime, and the congruence $an \equiv -b \bmod p$ is impossible.) Hence, there is a unique $u \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ such that $u \equiv -b/a \bmod p$.

For $i = 1, \dots, k$, set

$$a_i' = \begin{cases} a_i, & p \mid L_i(u), \\ pa_i, & p \nmid L_i(u), \end{cases} \qquad b_i' = \begin{cases} L_i(u)/p, & p \mid L_i(u), \\ L_i(u), & p \nmid L_i(u), \end{cases}$$

and write

$$L_i'(n') = a_i' n' + b_i'.$$

An immediate verification shows that (3.2), (3.3) and (3.5) remain true with a_i, b_i and Σ replaced by a_i', b_i' and $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{p\}$. Hence, defining for $x' \geq z' \geq 2$, the set

$$\mathcal{U}'(x', z') = \left\{0 \leq n' \leq x' : \gcd\big(L_1'(n') \cdots L_k'(n'),\ P_{\Sigma'}(z')\big) = 1\right\},$$

we may apply Proposition 3.5: there exists z_0', depending only on k such that, when $x' \geq (z')^{50k}$ and $z' \geq z_0'$, we have

$$\#\mathcal{U}'(x', z') \ll 2^{\#\Sigma'} \frac{x'}{(\log z')^k} \ll 2^{\#\Sigma} \frac{x'}{(\log z')^k}. \tag{4.3}$$

Every n with $p \mid L(n)$ can be written as $u + n'p$ with $n' \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $n \in \mathcal{U}(x, z)$, then clearly we have $0 \leq n' \leq x/p$. Also

$$L_i(n) = \begin{cases} pL_i'(n'), & p \mid L_i(u), \\ L_i'(n'), & p \nmid L_i(u) \end{cases} \qquad (i = 1, \dots, k).$$

It follows that the number of $n \in \mathcal{U}(x, z)$ such that $p \mid L(n)$ is bounded by $\#\mathcal{U}'(x/p, z)$.

Unfortunately, we cannot apply (4.3) with $x' = x/p$ and $z' = z$, because we do not have $x' \geq (z')^{50k}$. This is the main reason why we had to replace $\mathcal{U}(x, z)$ by $\mathcal{U}_1(x, z)$, because if $n \in \mathcal{U}_1(x, z)$ then we can bound x/p from below.

Indeed, let $n \in \mathcal{U}_1(x, z)$ be such that $p \mid L(n)$. By the definition of the set $\mathcal{U}_1(x, z)$, we know that $L(n)$ is composite and (4.2) implies that $L(n)$ is not divisible by any primes from Σ. Hence $L(n)/p$ must be divisible by some prime $p' \geq z$. In particular, $|L(n)/p| \geq z$, which implies that $x/p \geq z/M - 1$ (recall that $M = \max\{|a|, |b|\}$). Now setting $x' = x/p$ and $z' = (z/M - 1)^{1/50k}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{n \in \mathcal{U}_1(x, z) : p \mid L(n)\} &\leq \#\mathcal{U}'(x/p, z) \\ &\leq \#\mathcal{U}'(x', z') \\ &\ll 2^{\#\Sigma} \frac{x'}{(\log z')^k} \\ &\ll 2^{\#\Sigma} \frac{x/p}{(\log(z/M - 1))^k}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

provided

$$(z/M-1)^{1/50k} \geq z_0'. \tag{4.5}$$

If we define $z_3 = \max\{M(z_0')^{50k} + M, 4M^2\}$, then $z \geq z_3$ implies both (4.5) and $z/M - 1 \geq z^{1/2}$. Hence, the right-hand side of (4.4) is $O\big(2^{\#\Sigma}(x/p)(\log z)^{-k}\big)$, as wanted. □

We will also need the following easy lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a set of prime numbers, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ and $z_0 \geq 2$. Assume that for all $t \geq z_0$, we have $\pi_{\mathcal{P}}(t) \leq \varepsilon\pi(t)$. Then for $x \geq z \geq z_0$ we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{p\in\mathcal{P}\\ z\leq p<x}} \frac{1}{p} \ll \varepsilon \log\left(\frac{\log x}{\log z}\right) + \varepsilon,$$

the implied constant being absolute.

Proof. This is just partial summation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{p\in\mathcal{P}\\ z\leq p<x}} \frac{1}{p} &= \int_{z^-}^{x^-} \frac{1}{t} d\pi_{\mathcal{P}}(t) \\
&= \frac{\pi_{\mathcal{P}}(x^-)}{x} - \frac{\pi_{\mathcal{P}}(z^-)}{z} + \int_z^x \frac{\pi_{\mathcal{P}}(t)}{t^2} dt \\
&\leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon \int_z^x \frac{\pi(t)}{t^2} dt \\
&\ll \varepsilon + \varepsilon \int_z^x \frac{dt}{t\log t} \\
&= \varepsilon \log\left(\frac{\log x}{\log z}\right) + \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

as wanted. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let η, c_1 and z_1 be as in Theorem 3.1. Then for $x \geq z_1^{1/\eta}$, we have $\#\mathcal{U}_1 \geq c_1 x(\log x)^{-k}$, where we denote $\mathcal{U}_1 = \mathcal{U}_1(x, x^\eta)$.

Now let $\mathcal{P}$ be a set of prime numbers, and let $\mathcal{U}_2$ be the subset of $\mathcal{U}_1$ consisting of $n \in \mathcal{U}_1$ such that some $p \in \mathcal{P}$ divides $L_1(n)\dots L_k(n)$. Also let z_3 be as in Proposition 4.2. Define $z_2 \geq \max\{z_1, z_3\}$ so large that for $t \geq z_2$, we have $\pi_{\mathcal{P}}(t) \leq 2\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{P})\pi(t)$, and set $x_0 = z_2^{1/\eta}$. Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 imply that for $x \geq x_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\mathcal{U}_2 &\ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^k} \sum_{\substack{p\in\mathcal{P}\\ x^\eta\leq p<x}} \frac{1}{p} \\
&\ll \bar{\delta}(\mathcal{P}) \frac{x}{(\log x)^k} \left(\log\frac{\log x}{\log x^\eta} + 1\right) \\
&\ll \bar{\delta}(\mathcal{P}) \frac{x}{(\log x)^k},
\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants depend on k and on $\#\Sigma$.

It follows that there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$, depending on k and on $\#\Sigma$, such that, when $\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$\#\mho_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} c_1 \frac{x}{(\log x)^k} \leq \frac{1}{2} \#\mho_1.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Throughout the section, we assume that $f_1, \ldots, f_k$ are non-CM newforms (as defined in the beginning of Section 1) of weights $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_k$ respectively. We also fix, once and for all, distinct positive integers $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k$ satisfying $a_{f_i}(\nu_i) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. We will assume that $k \geq 2$ as otherwise there is nothing to prove.

5.1 Chinese Remaindering

Set $K = \max\{\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k\}$ and from now on consider m satisfying

$$m \equiv 0 \bmod (2K)!. \tag{5.1}$$

We write

$$m + \nu_i = \nu_i m_i \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k), \tag{5.2}$$

where each m_i is coprime to $(2K)!$. In particular,

$$\gcd(\nu_i, m_i) = 1 \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k). \tag{5.3}$$

Proposition 5.1. *There exists a positive real number c_0, depending on K and $f_1, \ldots, f_k$, such that for m satisfying (5.1) we have*

$$c_0 \frac{|a_{f_i}(m_i)|}{m_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \leq \frac{|a_{f_i}(m+\nu_i)|}{m^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \leq c_0^{-1} \frac{|a_{f_i}(m_i)|}{m_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k). \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. Since $a_{f_i}(\nu_i) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, we may define

$$c_0 = \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \min \left\{ \frac{|a_{f_i}(\nu_i)|}{\nu_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}}, \frac{\nu_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}}{2^{(\kappa_i-1)/2} |a_{f_i}(\nu_i)|} \right\}.$$

Since $m \geq 2K$, we have $(m+\nu_i)^{(\kappa_i-1)/2} \leq 2^{(\kappa_i-1)/2} m^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}$. Hence, by multiplicativity, we have

$$\frac{|a_{f_i}(m+\nu_i)|}{m^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \geq \frac{|a_{f_i}(m+\nu_i)|}{(m+\nu_i)^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} = \frac{|a_{f_i}(\nu_i)|}{\nu_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \frac{|a_{f_i}(m_i)|}{m_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \geq c_0 \frac{|a_{f_i}(m_i)|}{m_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|a_{f_i}(m+\nu_i)|}{m^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} &\le \frac{2^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}|a_{f_i}(m+\nu_i)|}{(m+\nu_i)^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \\ &= \frac{2^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}|a_{f_i}(\nu_i)|}{\nu_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}}\frac{|a_{f_i}(m_i)|}{m_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \\ &\le c_0^{-1}\frac{|a_{f_i}(m_i)|}{m_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}},\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

5.2 More Chinese Remaindering

Next we choose primes $p_1 < \cdots < p_k$ with $p_1 > 2K$ such that

$$a_{f_i}(p_i) \neq \pm 2p_i^{(\kappa_i-1)/2} \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k), \tag{5.5}$$

$$a_{f_i}(p_i^\ell) \neq 0 \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \ldots). \tag{5.6}$$

Existence of such primes is guaranteed by Propositions 2.1 and 2.2.

Now let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$ be positive integers which will be specified later. We now impose on m, besides (5.1), the conditions

$$m + \nu_i \equiv p_i^{\lambda_i} \bmod p_i^{\lambda_i+1} \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k). \tag{5.7}$$

Together with (5.1) this puts m into an arithmetic progression modulo A, where

$$A = (2K)! \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{\lambda_i+1}. \tag{5.8}$$

Write $m = An + B$, where $B < A$ is the smallest positive integer in this progression. Here, $n \ge 0$ is some non-negative integer. Then $m + \nu_i = \nu_i p_i^{\lambda_i}(a_i n + b_i)$, where

$$a_i = \frac{A}{\nu_i p_i^{\lambda_i}}, \quad b_i = \frac{B + \nu_i}{\nu_i p_i^{\lambda_i}} \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k) \tag{5.9}$$

are positive integers[9]. In particular, the numbers m_i defined in (5.2) are given by

$$m_i = p_i^{\lambda_i} L_i(n), \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k), \tag{5.10}$$

where $L_i(n) = a_i n + b_i$.

[9]There is no risk of confusing the coefficients $a_{f_i}(n)$ and the integers a_i.

5.3 Sieving and Sato-Tate

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\gcd(A, B+\nu_i) = \nu_i p_i^{\lambda_i} && (i = 1, \dots, k), \\ &a_i b_j - a_j b_i = \frac{A}{\nu_i \nu_j p_i^{\lambda_i} p_j^{\lambda_j}} (\nu_j - \nu_i) && (1 \le i, j \le k). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, it follows that the integers $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k$ defined in (5.9) satisfy (3.2) and (3.3). Moreover, setting

$$\Sigma = \{p \le 2K\} \cup \{p_1, \dots, p_k\},$$

conditions (3.5) and (4.1) hold true as well, which allows us to apply our sieving Theorems 3.1 and 4.1. Using them and the Sato-Tate conjecture (as stated in Proposition 2.1), we obtain the following.

Proposition 5.2. *There exists a positive number c_1, depending on K and on the forms f_i such that there exist infinitely many positive integers n with the following property*

$$c_1 \;\le\; \frac{|a_{f_i}(L_i(n))|}{L_i(n)^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \;\le\; c_1^{-1} \qquad (i = 1, \dots, k). \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. Let η and ε be as in Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.1 respectively. Both depend on k and $\#\Sigma$, but since $\#\Sigma = \pi(2K) + k$, this translates into dependence on K.

Now let $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ be the set of prime numbers p such that for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have $|a_{f_i}(p)|/p^{(\kappa_i-1)/2} \le \varepsilon/k$. Proposition 2.1 implies that its relative density is at most ε. Now Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.1 together imply that there exist infinitely many positive integers n with the following properties:

A. each $L_i(n)$ is a square-free positive integer[10];

B. for $i = 1, \dots, k$, every prime $p \mid L_i(n)$ satisfies $p \ge n^\eta$;

C. for $i = 1, \dots, k$, every prime $p \mid L_i(n)$ satisfies $|a_{f_i}(p)|/p^{(\kappa_i-1)/2} > \varepsilon/k$.

After discarding finitely many numbers n, item B implies that

B′. for $i = 1, \dots, k$, every prime $p \mid L_i(n)$ satisfies $p \ge L_i(n)^{\eta/2}$.

Hence, each $L_i(n)$ has at most $2/\eta$ prime divisors. Write $L_i(n) = q_1 \cdots q_s$, where $s \le 2/\eta$ and $q_1, \dots, q_s$ are distinct prime numbers satisfying

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{k} \;<\; \frac{|a_{f_i}(q_j)|}{q_j^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \;\le\; 2 \qquad (j = 1, \dots, s).$$

[10] Condition (4.1) implies that $L_i(n)$ cannot have divisors in Σ; in particular, "Σ-squarefree" from Theorem 3.1 can be replaced by "squarefree".

The inequality on the right is by Deligne's bound (2.3). By multiplicativity, we now obtain

$$\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{k}\Big)^{2/\eta} \;\le\; \frac{|a_{f_i}(L_i(n))|}{L_i(n)^{(\kappa_i-1)/2}} \;\le\; 2^{2/\eta}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Remark 5.3. *Slightly modifying the above argument, one proves the following quantitative result: there exist $c_2 > 0$ (depending on K) and $x_0 \ge 2$ (depending on K, on the forms f_i and on our choice of the primes p_i and the exponents λ_i) such that for $x \ge x_0$ the number of $n \le x$ with the property (5.11) is at least $c_2 x(\log x)^{-k}$. The constant c_2 is effective, but x_0 is not, because it depends on a "quantitative" form of the Sato-Tate conjecture, which is not known to be effective (to the best of our knowledge).*

5.4 The Exponents λ_i

We now fix a small parameter δ (to be specified later) and define, in terms of this δ, our $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$.

Proposition 5.4. *Let δ be a positive real number. Then there exist positive integers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ such that*

$$\frac{\Big|a_{f_1}\big(p_1^{\lambda_1}\big)\Big|}{p_1^{(\kappa_1-1)\lambda_1/2}} < \delta\frac{\Big|a_{f_2}\big(p_2^{\lambda_2}\big)\Big|}{p_2^{(\kappa_2-1)\lambda_2/2}} < \ldots < \delta^{k-1}\frac{\Big|a_{f_k}\big(p_k^{\lambda_k}\big)\Big|}{p_k^{(\kappa_k-1)\lambda_k/2}}. \tag{5.12}$$

We start with an easy lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *Let f be a newform of weight κ, let p be a prime number such that $a_f(p) \ne \pm 2p^{(\kappa-1)/2}$, and let ε a positive real number. Then there exists a positive integer λ such that $|a_f(p^\lambda)|p^{-(\kappa-1)\lambda/2} < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. We may assume $\theta_p/\pi \notin \mathbb{Q}$ as otherwise there is nothing to prove. Using (2.5), we know that

$$\frac{|a_f(p^\lambda)|}{p^{(\kappa-1)\lambda/2}} = \frac{|\sin((\lambda+1)\theta_p)|}{|\sin\theta_p|}.$$

Since $\theta_p/\pi \notin \mathbb{Q}$, selecting λ suitably, we can make $|\sin((\lambda+1)\theta_p)|$ as small as we please. □

Corollary 5.6. *Let f, g be newforms of weights κ, ρ, respectively, and let p, q be prime numbers. Also let μ be a positive integer and δ be a positive real number. Assume that $a_f(p) \ne \pm 2p^{(\kappa-1)/2}$ and $a_g(q^\mu) \ne 0$. Then there exists a positive integer λ such that*

$$\frac{|a_f(p^\lambda)|}{p^{(\kappa-1)\lambda/2}} \;<\; \delta\frac{|a_g(q^\mu)|}{q^{(\rho-1)\mu/2}}.$$

Proof. Apply Lemma 5.5 with $\varepsilon = \delta|a_g(q^\mu)|q^{-(\rho-1)\mu/2}$. □

Proof of Proposition 5.4. Set $\lambda_k = 1$ and afterwards define $\lambda_{k-1}, \dots, \lambda_1$ iteratively by applying Corollary 5.6 $(k-1)$-times. The hypothesis of Corollary 5.6 is assured because of (5.5) and (5.6). □

Remark 5.7. *Using Baker's theory of logarithmic forms, it is possible to prove that one can find suitable $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ effectively bounded in terms of $f_1, \dots, f_k$ and δ. We do not go into details since we do not need this.*

5.5 Conclusion

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.2. Let c_0 and c_1 be as in Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 respectively. Set $\delta = (c_0 c_1)^2/2$ and define the exponents $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ as in Proposition 5.4. (It is crucial here that both c_0 and c_1 depend only on K but not on the exponents λ_i.) Now if n is one of the infinitely many positive integers satisfying property (5.11), then the corresponding $m = An + B$ satisfies

$$|a_{f_1}(m+\nu_1)| \le \frac{1}{2}|a_{f_2}(m+\nu_2)| \le \cdots \le \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}|a_{f_k}(m+\nu_k)|,$$

as follows from (5.4), (5.10), (5.11) and (5.12). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Remark 5.8. *As Remark 5.3 suggests, we actually obtain the following quantitative results: for sufficiently large x, there is at least $cx(\log x)^{-k}$ positive integers $m \le x$ with the property* (1.4)*; here $c = c(K, f_1, \dots, f_k) > 0$ is effective and "sufficiently large" is not effective.*

6 Proof of Theorem 1.4

In this section k is a positive integer, and f is a non-CM newform, as defined in the beginning of Section 1. We want to show that the following three conditions are equivalent.

A. We have
$$a_f(n) \neq 0 \qquad (1 \le n \le k/2). \tag{6.1}$$

B. For some positive integer ν we have
$$a_f(\nu + n) \neq 0 \qquad (1 \le n \le k). \tag{6.2}$$

C. For every permutation σ of the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$, there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that
$$0 < |a_f(m+\sigma(1))| < |a_f(m+\sigma(2))| < \cdots < |a_f(m+\sigma(k))|.$$

We will assume that $k \geq 2$ as otherwise there is nothing to prove.

Condition C trivially implies B, and B implies C by putting $f_1 = \cdots = f_k = f$ and

$$\nu_i = \nu + \sigma(i) \qquad (1 \leq i \leq k)$$

in Theorem 1.2.

The implication B⇒A is easy. One readily sees that (6.1) is equivalent to the following:

$$a_f\left(p^\lambda\right) \neq 0 \text{ for every prime } p \text{ and positive } \lambda \text{ with } p^\lambda \leq k/2. \tag{6.3}$$

Since $k \geq 2p^\lambda$, the set $\{\nu+1, \ldots, \nu+k\}$ contains at least two consecutive multiples of p^λ and so one of them, say $\nu + h$, is divisible by p^λ but not by $p^{\lambda+1}$. Since a_f is multiplicative and $a_f(\nu+h) \neq 0$, we have $a_f(p^\lambda) \neq 0$.

We are left with the implication A⇒B. We deduce it from Theorems 3.1 and 4.1 with the help of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Let f be a newform. For every prime number p there exist infinitely many integers λ such that*

$$a_f\left(p^\lambda\right) \neq 0.$$

Proof. We shall indeed prove that among two consecutive non-negative integers $(\lambda, \lambda+1)$, at least one, say μ, satisfies $a_f\left(p^\mu\right) \neq 0$.

Our claim is true for $\lambda = 0$ since $a_f(1) = 1$. Let us assume (induction hypothesis) that it is true for a pair $(\lambda, \lambda+1)$.

If $a_f\left(p^{\lambda+1}\right) \neq 0$, then our claim is true for the pair $(\lambda+1, \lambda+2)$. On the other hand, if $a_f\left(p^{\lambda+1}\right) = 0$, then by our induction hypothesis, we have $a_f\left(p^\lambda\right) \neq 0$ and relation (2.2) implies that

$$a_f\left(p^{\lambda+2}\right) = a_f(p) a_f\left(p^{\lambda+1}\right) - p^{\kappa-1} a_f\left(p^\lambda\right) = -p^{\kappa-1} a_f\left(p^\lambda\right) \neq 0.$$

Hence, our claim is again true for the pair $(\lambda+1, \lambda+2)$. This proves the lemma. □

Alternatively, one may deduce the lemma from equations (2.5) and (2.6); we leave the details to the reader.

Proof of the implication A⇒B. We assume that (6.3) holds and want to find a positive integer ν such that (6.2) holds.

Since (6.3) is same when $k = 2\ell$ and $k = 2\ell+1$, namely $a_f\left(p^\lambda\right) \neq 0$ for $p^\lambda \leq \ell$, it is sufficient to consider the case when k is odd, say $k = 2\ell+1$.

We define Σ as the set of all primes $p \leq 2k$. By Lemma 6.1, to each $p \in \Sigma$ we may associate an integer λ_p such that

$$a_f\left(p^{\lambda_p}\right) \neq 0, \tag{6.4}$$

$$p^{\lambda_p} > k. \tag{6.5}$$

By the Chinese remainder theorem, one can find a positive integer r such that

$$r \equiv p^{\lambda_p} \bmod p^{\lambda_p+1} \qquad (p \in \Sigma). \tag{6.6}$$

We will show that there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that

$$a_f(Dm + r + j) \neq 0 \qquad (-\ell \leq j \leq \ell), \tag{6.7}$$

where

$$D = \prod_{p \in \Sigma} p^{\lambda_p+1}.$$

If m is any such integer, then, setting $\nu = r + Dm - \ell - 1$, we clearly obtain (6.2).

For $-\ell \leq j \leq \ell$, we introduce the linear forms $L_j(m) = a_j m + b_j$ by

$$Dm + r + j = \gcd(D, r + j)L_j(m) = \gcd(D, r + j)(a_j m + b_j).$$

(There is no risk of confusing the coefficients $a_f(n)$ and the integers a_j.) Let us first check that the k linear forms L_j satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.1.

- By construction, for every j, we have $a_j \neq 0$ and $\gcd(a_j, b_j) = 1$.
- For $i \neq j$, we have $D(r + j) - D(r + i) = D(j - i) \neq 0$. Since $a_i b_j - a_j b_i$ is a divisor of $D|j - i|$, it is not 0.
- By construction, a_i is a divisor of D which has only prime divisors from Σ.
- Similarly, $a_i b_j - a_j b_i$ is a divisor of $D|j - i|$, where D and $|j - i| \leq k$ have only prime divisors from Σ.
- We finally have to verify that every a_j is divisible by every prime in the set Σ. Since $r \equiv p^{\lambda_p} \bmod p^{\lambda_p+1}$ and $p^{\lambda_p} > k > \ell$, we have $\mathrm{ord}_p(r + j) \leq \lambda_p$ (where ord_p denotes the p-adic valuation). Now since

  $$\mathrm{ord}_p(a_j) = \mathrm{ord}_p(D) - \mathrm{ord}_p(r + j)$$

  and $p^{\lambda_p+1} \mid D$, we have $\mathrm{ord}_p(a_j) \geq 1$.

We can now apply Theorems 3.1 and 4.1, taking for the unwanted set of primes those which are not in Σ and for which $a_f(p) = 0$. Thus, there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that each of the k numbers $L_{-\ell}(m), \ldots, L_\ell(m)$ is square-free, not divisible by any prime from Σ nor by any prime p for which $a_f(p) = 0$. It follows that for such m, we have

$$L_j(m) \neq 0 \qquad (-\ell \leq j \leq \ell).$$

In order to prove that for these m we have (6.7), it is enough to prove that

$$a_f(\gcd(D, r + j)) \neq 0 \qquad (-\ell \leq j \leq \ell). \tag{6.8}$$

When $j = 0$, for any p in Σ we have $p^{\lambda_p} \| r$ so that $p^{\lambda_p} \| \gcd(D, r)$. Since $a_f(p^{\lambda_p}) \neq 0$ by (6.4), we obtain $a_f(\gcd(D, r)) \neq 0$ by multiplicativity.

If $j \neq 0$, then, for $p \in \Sigma$ we have $\mathrm{ord}_p(j) < \lambda_p$ because $p^{\lambda_p} > k$ by (6.5). Hence $p^\mu \| \gcd(D, r + j)$ implies that $p^\mu \| j$. It follows that $p^\mu \leq \ell \leq k/2$, and our assumption (6.1) implies that $a_f(p^\mu) \neq 0$. By multiplicativity, this proves (6.8) for $j \neq 0$ as well.

The proof of the implication A⇒B is now complete, and so is the proof of Theorem 1.4. □

Acknowledgements. F. L. worked on this paper during a visit to the Institute of Mathematics of Bordeaux as an ALGANT scholar in July 2011. He thanks ALGANT for support and the French Ministry of Defense for allowing him, after some time, to enter the IMB building. In addition, this author was also partially supported by grant CPRR160325161141 and an A-rated scientist award both from the NRF of South Africa and by grant no. 17-02804S of the Czech Granting Agency.

Yu. B. was partially supported by the ALGANT and by the Indo-European Action Marie Curie (IRSES moduli).

J.-M. D. was partially supported by the CEFIPRA project 5401-A and by the Indo-European Action Marie Curie (IRSES moduli).

S. G. was visiting the Institute of Mathematics of Bordeaux as an ALGANT scholar in 2014 when she started working on this project. She acknowledges support by the ALGANT, a SERB grant and the DAE number theory plan project.

During the final stage of preparation of this paper Yu. B. and J.-M. D. enjoyed hospitality of the Institute of Mathematical Sciences at Chennai.

The authors thank Satadal Ganguly, Florent Jouve and Gérald Tenenbaum for helpful advices.

References

[1] T. Barnet-Lamb, D. Geraghty, M. Harris, R. Taylor, A Family of Calabi-Yau Varieties and Potential Automorphy II, *Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ.* **47** (2011), 29–98.

[2] P. Deligne, La conjecture de Weill, *Publ. Math. IHES* **43** (1974), 273–307.

[3] M. Derickx, M. van Hoeij, J. Zeng, Computing Galois representations and equations for modular curves $X_H(\ell)$, arXiv:1312.6819 (2013).

[4] F. Diamond, J. Shurman, *A First Course in Modular Forms*, Grad. Texts in Math. 228, Springer, 2005.

[5] A. Ghosh, P. Sarnak, Real zeros of holomorphic Hecke cusp forms, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **14** (2012), 465–487.

[6] S. Gun, W. Kohnen, P. Rath, Simultaneous sign change of Fourier-coefficients of two cusp forms, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **105** (2015), 413–424.

[7] H. Halberstam, H.-E. Richert, *Sieve Methods*, LMS Monographs 4, Academic Press, London, 1974.

[8] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic Number Theory*, AMS Colloquium Publication **53**, Amer. Math. Soc., 2004.

[9] W. Kohnen, J. Sengupta, Signs of Fourier coefficients of two cusp forms of different weights, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), 3563–3567.

[10] S. Lang, H. Trotter, Primitive points on elliptic curves, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **8**3 (1977), no. 2, 289–292.

[11] K. Matomäki, On signs of Fourier coefficients of cusp forms, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **152** (2012), 207–222.

[12] K. Matomäki, M. Radziwiłł, Sign changes of Hecke eigenvalues, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **25** (2015), 1937–1955.

[13] L. J. Mordell, On Mr. Ramanujan's empirical expansions of modular functions, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **19** (1917) 117–124.

[14] M. Ram Murty and V. Kumar Murty, Odd values of fourier coefficients of certain modular forms, *Int. J. Number Theory* **3** (2007), 455–470.

[15] R. A. Rankin, Contributions to the theory of Ramanujan's function $\tau(n)$ and similar arithmetical functions. I. The zeros of the function $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau(n)/n^s$ on the line $\Re s = 13/2$. II. The order of the Fourier coefficients of integral modular forms, *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **35** (1939), 351–372.

[16] R. A. Rankin, An Ω-result for the coefficients of cusp forms, *Math. Ann.* **203** (1970), 239–250.

[17] J.-P. Serre, Divisibilité de certaines fonctions arithmétiques, Séminaire Delange-Pisot-Poitou. Théorie des nombres, **16** (1974), no. 1, 1–28.

[18] J.-P. Serre, Quelques applications du théorème de densité de Chebotarev, *Publ. Math. IHES* **54** (1981), 123–201.

[19] J. Zeng, L. Yin, On the computation of coefficients of modular forms: the reduction modulo p approach, *Math. Comp.* **84** (2015), 1469–1488.

Yuri F. Bilu
Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux, Université de Bordeaux and CNRS, 33405 Talence, France;
yuri@math.u-bordeaux.fr

Jean-Marc Deshouillers
Institut de Mathématique de Bordeaux, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux INP and CNRS, 33405 Talence, France;
jean-marc.deshouillers@math.u-bordeaux.fr

Sanoli Gun
Institute of Mathematical Sciences, HBNI, C.I.T Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600 113, India;
sanoli@imsc.res.in

Florian Luca
School of Mathematics, University of the Witwatersrand, Private Bag X3, Wits 2050, South Africa;
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences, University of Ostrava, 30. dubna 22, 701 03 Ostrava 1, Czech Republic;
florian.luca@wits.ac.za